

EIA-Funded Program Name:

*** Current Fiscal Year EIA Allocation to this EIA-Program:**

*** Name of Person Completing Survey and to whom EOC members may request additional information:**

*** Telephone number:**

*** E-mail:**

History of the program. Please mark the appropriate response (choose one):This program:

Was an original initiative of the Education Improvement Act of 1984

Was created or implemented as part of the Education Accountability Act of 1998

Has been operational for less than five years

Was funded by last fiscal year by general or other funds.

Is a new program implemented for the first time in the current fiscal year

Other

What SC laws, including provisos in the current year's general appropriation act, govern the implementation of this program? Provide complete citations from the SC Code of Laws including Title, Chapter, and Section numbers.

Proviso 1A.52. (SDE-EIA: XI.A.3-Institute of Reading)

Code of Laws:(MAX. 100 characters)

S.C. Code Ann. § 59-5-135 (2004)

General Appropriation Act, 2006 S.C. Acts 116,

Proviso Number:(MAX: 100 characters)

Provisos 1A.39 and 1A.46

What South Carolina regulations govern the implementation of this program? Provide specific references to the South Carolina Code of Regulations?

Regulations:

Do guidelines that have been approved by the State Board of Education, the Commission on higher Education or other governing board exist that govern the implementation of this program?

Yes

No

What are the primary objective(s) or goals of this program? Please distinguish between the long-term mission of the program and the current annual objectives of the program. (The goals or objectives should be in terms that can be quantified, evaluated and assessed.) (MAX 3500 characters)

Following are the goals and objectives of this program for the Institute of Reading.

To enhance teacher/administrator knowledge about reading research, theory and practice.

To encourage reflective practice through continuous examination of beliefs in relation to practice.

To explore with teachers/administrators the knowledge and the tools to assess students, to create appropriate context for them, and to instruct them in ways that nurture them as fluent, flexible and engaged readers.

To assist in the development of strategies that can be used for continuous inquiry and the improvement of teaching practices.

To create a network of teachers, principals and consultants who have a shared knowledge base about the teaching and learning of reading.

To develop structures within individual schools so that educators can engage in an independent and ongoing process of change.

These goals support the mission of increasing the knowledge base of teachers in effective literacy instruction and thereby increasing student achievement.

In the prior fiscal year, what primary program activities or processes were conducted to facilitate the program's performance in reaching the objective(s) as provided in question 7? What, if any, change in processes or activities are planned for the current fiscal year? (Examples of program processes would be: training provided, recruiting efforts made, technical assistance services, monitoring services, etc. Answers should be specific to the process undertaken at the state level to support the objectives of the program and should be quantifiable Please include any professional development services provided.)(MAX: 5000 characters)

The Institute of Reading provided long-term, job-embedded professional development for participating literacy coaches. To build a common knowledge base among all school-based literacy coaches, university faculty and regional literacy coaches worked collaboratively with the State Department of Education to provide graduate study in language and literacy to all coaches via summer study and monthly study throughout the school year. Coaches participated in 3 days of professional study each month and an extended summer study. Regional literacy coaches provided support to the school-based literacy coaches during monthly studies and through monthly visitation and technical assistance at the school site.

The Institute of Reading also required each participating school to create a School Leadership Team (SLT), composed of the administrator responsible for making instructional decisions, the literacy coach, the media specialist, a regular classroom teacher (content and/or ELA), and a special educator. The SLT scheduled (monthly) meetings throughout the year to devise and implement the school wide plan for literacy, monitor progress toward the literacy goals, and revise as needed. All members of the SLTs attended the state SLT professional development.

In the prior fiscal year and using the most recent data available, what were the direct products and services (outputs) delivered by this program? (Examples of program outputs would be: number of teachers attending professional development seminars, number of AP exams given and students taking AP classes, number of students served in the program, etc.)(MAX: 5000 characters)

In the prior fiscal year, the Institute of Reading supported two cohorts of middle grades coaches. SCRI-MG Phase 1 consisted of 18 literacy coaches working in 26 schools from 15 districts. SCRI-MG Phase 2 consisted of 21 literacy coaches working in 25 schools in 17 districts. Each of these literacy coaches provided professional development to language arts and content area teachers via study groups and classroom coaching.

What are the outcomes or results of this program? (Program outcomes can be both quantitative and qualitative and should address the program's objectives. Please use the most recent data available. Examples of outcomes would be: results of surveys, test data, increase in minority participation, reduction in achievement gaps, teacher loans awarded, textbooks purchased, etc.)(MAX: 5000 characters)

The following figures depict trends in PACT scores for grades 6-8 in Phase One of SCRI-MG. Student proficiency levels are reported for PACT as one of 4 levels; below basic, basic, proficient, or advanced. The percentage of students meeting standards on PACT is defined as scoring at the basic level or above.

Findings

Grade 6:
25 out of 33 schools (75.6%) demonstrated gains in grade 6 PACT scores between the baseline year and year three of implementation

18 out of 33 schools (54.5%) had gains greater than 5%, ranging from 5.2% - 17.3%

15 out of 36 schools (41.7%) scored above the 2006 state's percentage meeting standards

Grade 7:
20 out of 42 schools (47.6%) demonstrated gains in grade 7 PACT scores between the baseline year and year three of implementation

9 out of 42 schools (21.4%) had gains greater than 5%, ranging from 5.2% - 23.7%

19 out of 45 schools (42.2%) scored above the 2006 state's percentage meeting standards

Grade 8:
31 out of 42 schools (73.8%) demonstrated gains in grade 8 PACT scores between the baseline year and year three of implementation

23 out of 42 schools (54.8%) had gains greater than 5%, ranging from (6.0% - 18.8%)

19 out of 45 schools (46.7%) scored above the 2006 state's percentage meeting standards

Data source: <http://www.ed.sc.gov/topics/assessment/scores/>

Graphs prepared by the Office of Program Evaluation, University of South Carolina, September 2007

Program Evaluations

What was the date of the last external or internal evaluation of this program?

Has an evaluation been conducted?

Yes No

**If an evaluation was conducted, what were the results and primary recommendations of the evaluation?
(MAX: 2000 characters)**

Results above. No recommendations were given.

Can you provide a URL link, electronic version or hard copy of this evaluation to the Education Oversight Committee?

Yes

No

If no, why not?(MAX: 100 characters)

The following questions do NOT apply to programs having a program code beginning with 01. (These are programs administered by or through the Department of Education. The Office of Finance at the Department of Education will provide answers to these questions.) If your program code begins with 01, please hit the NEXT button below. Once you advance to the next page, hit the SUBMIT button.

Please mark the appropriate response:

The total amount of EIA funds requested for this program for the next fiscal year will be:

The same as appropriated in the current fiscal year's appropriation

An increase over the current fiscal year's appropriation

A decrease over the current fiscal year's appropriation

If you indicated an increase or decrease in funding for the next fiscal year, what is the total amount requested for this program for the next fiscal year?

If you indicated an increase or decrease, please describe the reasons for the increase or decrease. How will the increase or decrease impact the objectives of the program as answered in question 7?(MAX: 3500 characters)

Please fill in the attached charts to reflect the budget for this program in the prior fiscal year and the budget for this program in the current fiscal year.

Funding Source	Prior FY Actual	Current FY Estimated
EIA		
General Fund		
Lottery		
Fees		
Other Sources		
Grant		
Contributions, Foundation		
Other (Specify)		
Carry Forward from Prior Yr		
TOTAL		

Expenditures	Prior FY Actual	Current FY Estimated
Personal Service		
Contractual Services		
Supplies and Materials		
Fixed Charges		
Travel		
Equipment		
Employer Contributions		
Allocations to Districts/Schools/Agencies/Entities		
Other: Please explain		
Balance Remaining		
TOTAL		
#FTES		

Data entry complete for this year.

Will additional information (eg. charts, tables, graphs, etc.) be submitted under separate cover to EOC for this program? If so, submit to Melanie Barton at mbarton@eoc.sc.gov. The program number should be cited in the subject of the e-mail.

Yes No